

*Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park  
Park Advisory Commission Meeting*

November 17, 2005

Middletown Town Hall  
Middletown, Virginia

Meeting Agenda

- I) Review and Approval of Minutes from 15 September meeting (10 minutes)
- II) GMP Status Update (20 minutes)
- III) GMP Scoping Discussion – park partnerships (1 hour)
- IV) Introduction of Patrick Farris, Warren County representative to the Park Advisory Commission
- V) GMP Process – public scoping meetings (30 minutes)
  - A) Number of meetings
  - B) Location of meetings
- VI) Commission Polity (45 minutes)
  - A) Draft by-laws – discussion
  - B) Vice chair
  - C) Biographical Information
- VII) Old Business
- VIII) New Business
- IX) Next Meeting – 19 January 2006 in Strasburg

Meeting Notes

Commission members in attendance: Diann Jacox, Designated Federal Official (DFO); Mary Bowser; Kris Tierny; Elizabeth McClung; Fred Andreae; Howard Kittell; Gene Dicks; Gary Rinkerman; Dan Stickley; Jim Smalls.

Commission members absent: Richard Wilson; Richard Kleese; Alson Smith; Patrick Farris; Roy Downey.

Others in attendance: Chris Stubbs NPS; Marcus Ordonez, Shenandoah Co. Park & Rec.; Nora Amos; Steven Stubbs, NPS Volunteer; Stephanie Mangino, The Winchester Star; Jonathan Shacat, Northern Virginia Daily; H.T. Walter, Warren Co. landowner; Philip O. Stewart; George Pasquest, Warren C. landowner; George Blount, Warren Co. landowner

Chairwoman Mary Bowser chaired the meeting.

The notes from the 15 September 2005 meeting were reviewed and approved as written by unanimous vote.

Mr. Chris Stubbs of the National Park Service provided a general management plan status update to the Commission, the details of which were handed out to the Commissioners and the public.

There was a question and answer session between Mr. Stubbs and the Commissioners about the scoping process for the general management plan. Mr. Stubbs agreed to provide the Commissioners with any regulatory or policy guidelines on the scoping process.

Mr. Stubbs then conducted a scoping session on partnerships with the Commissioners that lasted approximately two hours. The notes from the scoping session are appended to the end of these meeting minutes.

By-laws for the park advisory commission were discussed. Diann Jacox stated that the draft by-laws, prepared by Gary Rinkerman, have been sent to the Dept. of Interior Solicitor for review. Gary Rinkerman requested a written response from the Solicitor as quickly as possible.

There was a general discussion about the by-laws level of specificity and detail, with some commissioners feeling that the draft by-laws are too long and detailed; others feel that the by-laws must be this detailed. It was agreed that the issue of by-laws would be taken up when the response from the Solicitor is received.

Mr. Kris Tierney was elected Commission Vice Chair by unanimous vote.

A request was made that the Commissioner name plates be printed with a larger font so they will be more visible.

A concern was raised about the lack of attendance of certain Commissioners. Diann Jacox, acting as Designated Federal Official, stated that she would pursue the matter.

The Commissioners requested a printed list of all meeting dates through July.

After a brief discussion of the next meeting, which will be on 19 January 2006 in Strasburg, the meeting was adjourned.

#### List of handouts provided at 17 November meeting

1. Meeting agenda
2. GMP status update

## Appendix to the 17 November 2005 Meeting Minutes

Scoping Meeting with  
Park Advisory Commission  
17 November 2005  
Middletown Town Hall  
Middletown, Virginia

### Topic: Partnerships and Organizational Effectiveness

#### Goals (presented to the Commissioners):

1. The park will have a durable management structure that will outlast current interests and stakeholders and will provide for the long-term protection of Cedar Creek and Belle Grove NHP.
2. Visitors will have a “seamless” experience as they travel through the park, experiencing continuity of management and not recognizing they are transitioning from one property to the next.

All agree that goal #1 is good, but change the wording to read:

*The park will have a durable management structure that ~~will outlast current interests and stakeholders and~~ will provide for the long-term protection of Cedar Creek and Belle Grove NHP.*

#### Goal #2 discussion:

- Each partner property must maintain its own unique identity
- Diversity among partners is important
- Some don't like the word “seamless”, but do want the park to have a unique branding
- Consistent signage important
- Branding important, but not necessarily a “seamless” experience
- Partners must coordinate on what story is given to the visitor – coordinate interpretation
- The partnership must be seamless at the visitor center, where the overview story is presented
- A visitor center can serve as a starting point for the visitor
- Partners can collaborate on training staff to give a consistent message
- Belle Grove is seeking help from NPS in interpreting natural resources
- The Native American story is important

Other possible goals:

- “Inclusive Interpretation”
- Resource conservation

Other Partnership ideas:

- Allowing other partnerships in the future; invite other groups

- Actively involve local governments – they are an ally

Partnership Scoping Questions (presented to the Commissioners):

1. How will the Key Partners and NPS develop a “seamless” visitor experience?
2. How will the Key Partners and NPS coordinate management and operations of the park?
3. What level of participation will the Key Partners have in operations and management outside their individual properties? Will the Key Partners have a role in the management of each others’ properties?
4. Will the NPS become a major landholder with significant operations, or will the park’s land base continue to be owned primarily by the Key Partners?
5. Will the NPS have a “traditional” operation at the park, or will the agency be more focused on technical and financial support to the partners?
6. What will be the shared responsibilities of the Key Partners and the NPS? What responsibilities will not be shared?
7. How will the NPS interact with the Key Partners in the management of land that they continue to own and facilities that they continue to operate (i.e., the Keister tract; Belle Grove)?

Question#1 discussion: How will the Key Partners and NPS develop a “seamless” visitor experience?

- Replace “seamless” with “coordinated”
- Branding – signage, graphics, etc.
- Visitor experience important
- We must let people know when they are in the park; very important that visitors know when they are “in” and when they are “out”
- Common signage – key to transportation
- Look at other partnership parks for examples of coordination and “seamless”
- Visitor experience includes visitor activities
  - How to handle different partners’ positions on permissible activities (i.e., hunting)?
- Defining where you are within the park – there must be a distinction between public and private land
- Three main land ownership status within park:
  - Private
  - Partner
  - NPS
- **We should encourage consistency among public trust (partners and NPS) land owners in their policies and permissible activities – a good way for the partners to collaborate**
- We need to tell the story that this is a partnership park, even possibly including “A Partnership Park” in the subtitle of the park name

Question #3 discussion: What level of participation will the Key Partners have in operations and management outside their individual properties? Will the Key Partners have a role in the management of each others' properties?

- We must look at overlap of mutual interests
- We must coordinate efforts rather than have a role in the management of each others' property
- We need a management entity or representative body to handle management of mutual interests
- How do partners affect each other?
- How do partners affect private landowners?
- Partners should coordinate hours of use
- Partners should coordinate events
- We must look at other NPS partnership models when developing alternatives – reading materials; speaker; field trip

Question #4 discussion: Will the NPS become a major landholder with significant operations, or will the park's land base continue to be owned primarily by the Key Partners?

- What's feasible here – will NPS ever have funds to buy land?
- We must put it in the GMP so Congress will hopefully fund land acquisition for NPS
- **Consensus: NPS should purchase land**
- Question about land outside boundary and "sites of significance" statement in legislation under advisory commission – can NPS buy land outside the boundary?
- Privately owned land can be protected through easements and zoning
- NPS should be a major player in the preservation of land whether or not NPS owns land within the park
- Change "will" in Q4 to "should"

Question #5 discussion: Will the NPS have a "traditional" operation at the park, or will the agency be more focused on technical and financial support to the partners?

- NPS as an anchor to tie partners and lands together
- NPS should be more focused on support than a traditional operation
- Belle Grove is seeking Interp and law enforcement rangers from NPS
- Some elements of traditional operations necessary, but emphasize technical support, financial support, and coordination
- **NPS role should be coordinator among partners**
- Hybrid between trad. And non-trad operation

Question #6 discussion: What will be the shared responsibilities of the Key Partners and the NPS? What responsibilities will not be shared?

- Shared responsibilities: land protection, scheduling events, interpretation, shared infrastructure (e.g., fences, trails, and trans. property facilities), planning
- Not shared: individual property maintenance and management

Discussion of law enforcement:

- NPS has jurisdiction on NPS land
- Question as to whether NPS can do law enforcement on partner land
- NPS rangers at park dedication at Belle Grove, accompanying Director Maniella – LE accompanied the Director to provide staff protection for her
- Belle Grove would like NPS law enforcement in the future on their property
- What is desired level of LE at partner properties?
- NPS will research this

Discussion of maintenance and trails:

- There will be shared areas
- Park trails – NPS to do maintenance? NPS could provide consistency
- Trails – will there be easement?
- Will we have recreational, non-interpretive trails? Probably will happen at Keister tract
- Trail linkage to National Forest important
- How will partners handle liability insurance on trails?